



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,975	01/20/2004	Bettina Walter	MS1-1801US	3480
22801	7590	06/16/2008		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
WHIPPLE, BRIAN P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/760,975

Applicant(s)

WALTER ET AL.

Examiner

Brian P. Whipple

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/13/08 and 6/4/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: claim 23 and/or the specification must be amended in such a manner as to provide antecedent basis for the phrase "one physical component" or the term should be removed from the claim; no new matter should be added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by BigBlueBall Forums (BigBlueBall); Trillian Emoticons; 8/7/02; BigBlueBall.com.

6. As to claim 1, BigBlueBall discloses selecting pixels to be used as an emoticon (Page 3);

assigning a character sequence to the pixels (Page 3); and

transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the pixels at the destination (Page 3), wherein the emoticon is to be substituted for the character sequence within the text message (Page 3).

BigBlueBall discloses that text shortcuts for emoticons were known in the art as early as 8/7/02 (the date of relevant forum post). For example, the poster discloses that a clown emoticon may be sent using a variety of shortcuts (Page 3, paragraph 4). Additionally, the poster states that AIM, MSN, Yahoo, etc. look at text that is sent, (clown) for instance, and then convert it to an emoticon (Page 3, paragraph 8).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dave Copeland (Copeland); E-mail's signature smiley face is long in the tooth; September 20, 2002; Pittsburgh Tribune-Review.

8. As to claim 1, Copeland discloses selecting pixels to be used as an emoticon (Page 2); assigning a character sequence to the pixels (Page 2); and transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the pixels at the destination (Page 2), wherein the emoticon is to be substituted for the character sequence within the text message (Page 2).

Copeland discloses that the substitution of the three smiley characters for a graphic (Page 2, paragraph 6) was known to be in some Microsoft applications as early as 9/20/02 (the date of Copeland's article).

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ultimate Metal Forum; Smiley Emoticons; September 5th, 2002; UltimateMetal.com.

10. As to claim 1, Ultimate Metal Forum discloses selecting pixels to be used as an emoticon (Pages 1 and 7-8); assigning a character sequence to the pixels (Pages 1 and 7-8); and transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the pixels at the destination (Pages 1 and 7-8), wherein the emoticon is to be substituted for the character sequence within the text message (Pages 1 and 7-8).

Ultimate Metal Forum discloses that emoticons may be used in posts (Page 1) and then provides a link (Page 1) to the emoticons that may be used. This list shows that numerous emoticons exist that are linked to text shortcuts (Pages 7-8).

11. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aaron of Borg (The Easter Egg Archive); Yahoo Messenger 5.5 hidden smileys; 10/10/02; The Easter Egg Archive.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sector #101; Yahoo Messenger Emoticons; 8/28/02; Sector #101.

12. As to claim 1, The Easter Egg Archive and Sector #101 both disclose selecting pixels to be used as an emoticon (Page 1 of both);

assigning a character sequence to the pixels (Page 1 of both); and

transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the pixels at the destination (Page 1 of both), wherein the emoticon is to be substituted for the character sequence within the text message (Page 1 of both).

The Easter Egg Archive and Sector #101 both disclose (on each one's respective first page) that Yahoo Messenger 5.5 contained emoticons that were linked to text shortcuts as early as 10/10/02 and 8/28/02 respectively (the respective posting/updating dates of the prior arts).

13. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 11-12, 14, 21, 23-25, 30-31, 33, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Challapali, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0194006 A1.

14. As to claim 1, Challapali discloses a method, comprising:

selecting pixels to be used as an emoticon ([0020], ln. 12-16; [0021], ln. 1-5);

assigning a character sequence to the pixels ([0021], ln. 5-8; [0023], “resulting from an angry emoticon string >:-<”); and

transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the pixels at the destination (Fig. 1; [0011]), wherein the emoticon is to be substituted for the character sequence within the text message ([0011]; [0027], ln. 1-3).

Examiner will now summarize the above cited paragraphs.

Challapali teaches a method for converting received emoticon strings to facial animations. Clearly, a facial animation is a graphical display that is comprised of pixels. Therefore, either the original definition of facial animations or the inputting of emoticon strings by a user which then results directly in the execution of a facial animation may be seen as the selection of pixels to be used as an emoticon. In other words, a programmer

creating an animated emoticon or a user causing an animated emoticon to be displayed is selecting pixels, because the animated emoticon itself is directly comprised of pixels.

Challapali mentions that the aforementioned facial animations occur as a direct result of character sequences, or emoticon strings, such as :-) and >:-<.

Challapali also clearly shows that text messages are received from a first user by a second user and that appropriate processing occurs to substitute emoticon strings within the text message for corresponding facial animations. Paragraph [0011] and Figure 1 in particular clearly disclose a text message is sent by a first user, processed as incoming data by a data import system at a second location remote from the first user, and text-to-animation substitution occurs by a text-to-animation system.

As discussed in the interview conducted on 5/28/08, Applicant felt that the prior art cited in the previous Office action did not clearly disclose that the substitution for the character sequence did not occur within the text message, as the emoticon was separately displayed outside of the conversation itself. Applicant may feel similarly about the prior art of Challapali in that the text message itself is substituted for animation, and therefore the emoticon is not within the text message itself.

However, as discussed in the aforementioned interview, Examiner stated he did not feel the current amendment requires an explicit substitution of the emoticon into the text

message for the character sequence within the text message. That is because the way the claim is written currently, only the character sequence itself must be interpreted as occurring within the text message, given the broadest reasonable interpretation (as allowed under MPEP 2111).

The claim simply states that the emoticon is to be substituted for the character sequence within the text message. This is the case in Challapali. The character sequence within the text message is received by the data import system, and a text-to-animation system causes a facial animation to be substituted for corresponding emoticon strings in the text message. The claim does not require that the emoticon is to be substituted within the text message for the character sequence within the text message.

15. As to claim 2, Challapali discloses the pixels comprise a pixel array of pre-determined dimensions (Fig. 2; Fig. 3; [0024]).

Challapali does not explicitly disclose that the pixel array is of pre-determined dimensions, but this is clearly the case for the pre-determined facial animations of Challapali. Emoticon strings are converted into appropriate facial animations and these are pre-defined as seen in Figures 2 and 3 and discussed in paragraph [0024], as well as the citations discussed for claim 1 above. A pre-defined facial animation inherently has pre-determined dimensions.

Absent an explicit mention of such, it would not be reasonable to interpret the facial animations are random in their dimensions.

16. As to claim 4, Challapali discloses the character sequence allows real-time mapping to the pixels (Fig. 2; Fig. 3; [0004]; [0011]).

Challapali discloses the integration of facial animations into real-time on-line chat. The substitution of facial animations for text strings occurs in real-time, as Challapali has already disclosed the on-line chat as being real-time, and additionally discloses that the substitution of facial animations occurs according to pre-defined associations between facial animations and corresponding emoticon strings.

17. As to claim 6, Challapali discloses transmitting the character sequence in a real-time first communication ([0004]; [0011]); and

transmitting data representing the pixels in a second communication, wherein the data reconstructs the pixels in place of the character sequence in the real-time first communication (Fig. 1; [0011]).

Challapali teaches that a first communication is received from a first user, which consists of text data comprising word strings and emoticon strings. This first communication is parsed by a remote system and, in place of the first communication, the end user receives a

second communication comprising facial animations in place of the emoticon strings in the text message.

18. As to claim 7, Challapali discloses the data comprises a portable network graphics file (Fig. 1; [0011]; [0021], ln. 8-13).

The facial animations of Challapali are graphics files. It may be assumed that they may be portable over the network. The text-to-animation system is a part of the client system and stores appropriate facial animations. Nothing in Challapali would appear to prevent the transmission of the graphics file to other systems over the network.

19. As to claim 11, Challapali discloses the transmitting uses at least one of an object store (Fig. 1; [0019, ln. 1-5) and an object transport mechanism (Fig. 1; [0011]).

Challapali discloses that at least the software programs used are stored. Additionally, the pre-definition of facial animations to corresponding emoticon strings indicate to Examiner that Challapali must store the facial animations and the mapping between emoticon strings and the facial animations. Challapali explicitly discloses an object transport mechanism as seen in the sections of Challapali cited both for claim 11 and for claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2146

20. As to claim 12, Challapali discloses the transmitting comprises instant messaging (Fig.

1; [0004]; [0020], ln. 2-11).

21. As to claims 14, 23, and 35, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1

above.

22. As to claim 21, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claims 1 and 6 above.

23. As to claim 24, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.

Facial animations were created and mapped to character sequences by the creator of the text-to-animation system. Since the user interface is not required to be client-side by the claim, it is understood that the provider of the text-to-animation service mapped custom facial animations to character sequences that are then implemented by users of the service in interfaces for real-time chat.

24. As to claim 25, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claims 1, 6, and 11 above.

25. As to claim 30, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 24 above.

26. As to claim 31, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 4 above.
27. As to claim 33, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 6 above.
28. As to claim 36, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

29. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claim 1 above, in view of AllAlias.com; MUST READ: Signature/Avatar Rules, Updated 5-23-03; 9/6/03; AllAlias.com.

31. As to claim 3, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 2 above.

The definition of the pixel grid as 19 x 19 is merely a design choice; it is known in the art that an icon may be constructed to conform to various pixel dimensions.

Additionally, pixel grids for emoticons were known to be required to conform to a 19 x 19 pixel grid at the time of the invention. This is shown, for example, by the forum rules for AllAlias.com. The signature rules require smilies or similar images must be 19x19 pixels (Page 1, SIGNATURE RULES).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali by defining the pixel grid as 19 x 19, as this was a commonly used limit on emoticons at the time of the invention as taught by AllAlias.com. To not limit emoticons in such a way would lead to massive emoticons that would consume undue bandwidth and processing power of networking systems, as well as lead to end user frustration at receiving massively sized emoticons in instant messages and/or forum posts.

32. Claims 5, 7, 26, 28-29, and 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claims 1, 6, 23, and 30 above, in view of Chodor et al. (Chodor), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0036990 A1.

33. As to claim 5, Challapali does not explicitly disclose the parsing of the character sequence into an object name for the pixels, wherein the object name includes an identifier of the pixels and a location of the pixels.

However, Challapali does disclose the mapping of a character sequence to a corresponding facial animation, comprising pixels, as discussed above. This is accomplished by the receiving system parsing received messages for word strings and emoticon strings, also discussed above. Therefore, at the very least, Challapali must extract an object name for the pixels. This is because Challapali parses text messages for emoticon strings and substitutes corresponding facial animations for the emoticon strings. In order to identify the association between an emoticon string and a corresponding facial animation, after the parsing of the text message for the emoticon string, the corresponding facial animation must be identified and therefore an object name clearly exists for the facial animation.

Clearly, the text-to-animation system has means for receiving an emoticon string, identifying a corresponding facial animation, and displaying this facial animation to the end user. In order to do so, the facial animation must contain a mapping to the emoticon string, and the facial animation must be located in the system, and displayed appropriately. This requires that actions identical or similar to the ones claimed be performed.

Additionally, even if Applicant is to argue that Challapali does not disclose the object name includes an identifier of the pixels and a location of the pixels, this is known in the art, as is shown by Chodor. An example of a character sequence that is parsed for an object name

that includes an identifier of pixels and a location of pixels would be a URL that corresponds to an image.

Chodor discloses the parsing of the character sequence into an object name for the pixels ([0081]), wherein the object name includes an identifier of the pixels and a location of the pixels ([0082]). Examiner notes that Chodor does not need to disclose the parsing of the character sequence into an object name, as this is inherent to Challapali as discussed above.

Text messages are known in the art to be parsed for text corresponding to a URL and translated into a corresponding hyperlink. Additionally, a user copying and entering the URL received in the email message would have the text parsed by a web browser when entered into the address field. Furthermore, the URL in Chodor includes both a picture identifier of 9897 and a location, as the URL itself leads to the location of the image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali by including an identifier of pixels and a location of the pixels in an object name as taught by Chodor in order to identify images and their locations to a user/system so that the user/system may access and view the corresponding image.

34. As to claim 7, Challapali discloses the data comprises a portable network graphics file (Fig. 1; [0011]; [0021], ln. 8-13).

The facial animations of Challapali are graphics files. It may be assumed that they may be portable over the network. The text-to-animation system is a part of the client system and stores appropriate facial animations. Nothing in Challapali would appear to prevent the transmission of the graphics file to other systems over the network.

Additionally, Chodor discloses data comprising a portable network graphics file as discussed for claim 5 above. The URL links to an image and therefore the image file may be ported over the network via the URL. The reasons for doing so are the same as given for claim 5 above. Namely, allowing a user/system to access and view an image.

35. As to claims 26 and 32, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 5 above.

36. As to claims 28-29, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 11 above.

37. Claims 8-10, 15-16, 27, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claims 1, 14, 23, and 30 above, in view of Chodor as applied to claims 5, 26, and 32 above, and further in view of Hickman et al. (Hickman), U.S. Patent No. 7,013,327 B1.

38. As to claim 8, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 5 above.

Challapali and Chodor disclose parsing the character sequence into an identifier and a location of the pixels as discussed for claim 5 above. Additionally, Chodor discloses the identifier and location being included in a message that includes the character sequence, in that Chodor disclosed a URL being included in a message and the URL including the identifier and the location of the corresponding image ([0080], ln. 29-32; [0081]; [0082]).

Accordingly, Challapali and Chodor are merely silent on storing the identifier and the location in a header.

However, Hickman discloses storing an identifier and a location in the header of a message (Fig. 22A; Col. 18, ln. 45-48).

The combination of Challapali, Chodor, and Hickman results in an obvious combination to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that would result in the claimed subject matter of claim 8. Namely, Chodor discloses that a URL includes an identifier and a location of the corresponding file. Hickman goes on to disclose that a header may include a reference to the URL itself for display to an end user. Therefore, the combination of Chodor and Hickman would lead to the obvious conclusion that a webpage may be created that includes an image and a header identifying the URL of the webpage, the URL including an identifier and a location. The message, i.e. the webpage, includes the character sequence itself, i.e. the URL.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali and Chodor by including the identifier and the location in the header of the message that includes the character sequence as taught by Hickman in order to display the identifier and the location, that is the URL, to the end user in the webpage itself so as to provide easy access to it.

39. As to claim 9, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 5 above.

Claim 5 includes a limitation indicating the object name includes the identifier and the location. The rejection of claim 5 above showed that the object name may be separated into parts indicating the identifier and the location. So the identifier and the location are parts of an object name for the pixels.

40. As to claim 10, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claims 5 and 8 above.

The object name was shown to comprise the identifier and the location in the rejection of claim 5 above, and as discussed for claim 9 above. Additionally, the inclusion of the identifier and the location in the header of a message was discussed in the rejection of claim 8 above.

41. As to claims 15 and 34, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 8 above.

42. As to claim 16, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 9 above.

43. As to claim 27, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 10 above.

44. Claims 8-10, 15-16, 27, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claims 1, 14, 23, and 30 above, in view of Chodor as applied to claims 5, 26, and 32 above, and further in view of Dawson, U.S. Patent No. 6,252,588 B1.

45. As to claim 8, as opposed to Hickman, alternatively Dawson discloses storing an identifier and a location of pixels in the header of a message. Dawson may be interpreted as being more relevant to the disclosure of the instant application as Dawson parses a received email message header for an image and then displays the image to the recipient of the message (Col. 20, ln. 56-61). In other words, the character sequence (that is the file name/path identifying the image) in the header is translated into a corresponding image by Dawson. This is analogous to the instant application in that a character sequence is also translated into an image (a graphical emoticon).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali and Chodor by including the identifier and the location in the header of the message that includes the character sequence as taught by Dawson in order to parse the header to identifying the identifier and the location of a corresponding image and display the image to the end user. Including this in the header as opposed to the body of the message, leads to quicker access to the corresponding image, as the body of the message need not be examined as part of the process. This is more efficient, as the header is typically relatively small and limited in size, as opposed to the body which may be much larger and thus take more time to examine than the header.

46. As to claim 9, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 5 above.

Claim 5 includes a limitation indicating the object name includes the identifier and the location. The rejection of claim 5 above showed that the object name may be separated into parts indicating the identifier and the location. So the identifier and the location are parts of an object name for the pixels.

47. As to claim 10, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claims 5 and 8 above.

The object name was shown to comprise the identifier and the location in the rejection of claim 5 above, and as discussed for claim 9 above. Additionally, the inclusion of

the identifier and the location in the header of a message was discussed in the rejection of claim 8 above.

48. As to claims 15 and 34, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 8 above.

49. As to claim 16, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 9 above.

50. As to claim 27, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 10 above.

51. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Day et al. (Day), U.S. Publication No. 2005/0027839 A1.

52. As to claim 13, Challapali discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including data representing the pixels in a single instant message (see the rejection of claim 1 above for a discussion on how Challapali translates the emoticon strings in an instant message into facial animations), but is silent on the instant messaging has a limited data capacity that excludes including data representing the pixels in a single instant message that also includes data representing a threshold amount of text.

However, Day discloses a method by which every time a threshold amount of text in a message is reached, that portion of the message is transmitted without user intervention, and the user is allowed to continue typing the remainder of the intended message (Abstract). Thus, Day discloses instant messaging has a limited data capacity that includes including data in a single instant message that includes data representing a threshold amount of text. An outcome of Day's system is that any text typed after a threshold point will be excluded from the portion of the text sent up to the threshold. Therefore, this would include any emoticon strings entered by the user after the threshold is reached. Therefore, the combination of Challapali and Day would result in the claimed subject matter of claim 13.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali by having a limited data capacity on instant messaging and excluding data representing pixels in a single instant message that also includes data representing a threshold amount of text as taught by Day in order to conform with data capacity requirements placed on instant messages by the instant messaging service provider, but preventing the need for the user to actively pay attention to such a limit, instead allowing transparent conformance to the limit through automatic sending of threshold amounts of text.

53. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claim 14 above, in view of Jilk, JR. et al. (Jilk), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010746 A1.

54. As to claim 17, Challapali discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 14.

It may be interpreted that the pixel array has been previously stored in local store medium and therefore it is always determined that there is a mapping to it (see the rejections of claims 1 and 11 above).

However, Examiner believes Applicant is attempting to claim caching. For the purposes of expedited prosecution, prior art related to caching is now discussed.

Jilk discloses retrieving includes mapping to a local storage medium to determine if a pixel array has been previously stored in the local storage medium ([0164]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali by checking for cached images as taught by Jilk in order to improve performance and reduce load in the server providing the image (Jilk: [0164]).

55. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali and Jilk as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Goodwin, III et al. (Goodwin), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0065931 A1.

56. As to claim 18, Challapali and Jilk disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 17, including caching images (as discussed for claim 17 above), but are silent on the cache comprising temporary files used by a web browser.

However, this is one of the most well known uses of caching in the field. Goodwin discloses using a cache of temporary files to be used by a web browser ([0005], ln. 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali and Jilk by caching temporary files used by a web browser as taught by Goodwin so that the same content need not be downloaded again the next time the web content is accessed (Goodwin: [0005], ln. 1-6).

57. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claim 14 above, in view of Jilk as applied to claim 17 above, further in view of Goldschneider et al. (Goldschneider), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0107925 A1, and further in view of Huntington et al. (Huntington), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0131098 A1.

58. As to claim 19, Challapali and Jilk disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 14, including checking for the pixel array on a local storage medium (see the rejection of claim 17 above), but is silent on if the pixel array is not located in the local storage medium, then attempting to establish a direct link with a sender of the communication to retrieve the pixel array from a storage medium associated with the sender; and if a directly link to the sender cannot be established, then retrieving the pixel array through a server between the sender of the communication and the recipient of the communication.

However, Goldschneider discloses if a file is not located in local storage medium, then attempting to establish a direct link with a sender of a communication to retrieve the pixel array from a storage medium associated with the sender ([0032]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali and Jilk by enabling a recipient to request retransmission of a file as taught by Goldschneider in order to allow a recipient to receive a file that was either lost or never received properly.

Challapali, Jilk, and Goldschneider are silent on if a directly link to the sender cannot be established, then retrieving the pixel array through a server between the sender of the communication and the recipient of the communication.

However, Huntington discloses if a directly link to a sender cannot be established, then retrieving a file through a server between the sender of a communication and a recipient of the communication ([0203]).

Huntington teaches a method by which content unavailable from the intended sender can instead be sent from a cache server.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali, Jilk, and Goldschneider by acquiring content from a cache server if access to the original sender cannot be established as taught by Huntington in order to access content from a cache server even when the original sender cannot properly send the requested content (Huntington: [0203]).

59. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali, Jilk, Goldschneider, and Huntington as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Zhao, U.S. Patent No. 7,353,253 B1.

60. As to claim 20, Challapali, Jilk, Goldschneider, and Huntington describe the invention substantially as in parent claim 19, but are silent on a direct link using a peer-to-peer connection using one of TCP or UDP.

However, Zhao discloses a direct link using a peer-to-peer connection using UDP (Fig. 1; Col. 6, ln. 37-39 and 42-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali, Jilk, Goldschneider, and Huntington by including a direct link using a peer-to-peer connection using UDP as taught by Zhao in order to avoid the extra processing required in a client-server model (Col. 6, ln. 42-48) and in order to take advantage of the bandwidth consumption efficiency of the UDP multicast form of delivery (Col. 6, ln. 42-48).

61. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challapali as applied to claim 21 above, in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

62. As to claim 22, Challapali discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 21, but does not explicitly teach adapting images of various sizes and formats to a pixel array format of predetermined size, for use as the graphics data of emoticons ("for use as the graphics data of emoticons" is intended use and therefore not given weight).

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that adapting images of various sizes and formats to a pixel array format of predetermined size was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Applicant fails to disclose the step as occurring automatically. Methods for conforming to a requirement for pixel dimensions such as a user cropping and/or shrinking an image prior to use (such as the requirement for buddy icons to meet pixel dimension requirements or an emoticon to meet the required 19 x 19 pixel grid limitation as discussed for claim 3 above) were well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challapali by adapting images of various sizes and formats to a pixel array format of predetermined size to get this well-known feature.

Conclusion

63. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miller, U.S. Patent No. 6,629,793 B1 discloses an emoticon keyboard that includes personal keys among the pre-defined emoticon keys (Fig. 3; Fig. 4).

Art Unit: 2146

64. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152

Application/Control Number: 10/760,975

Page 30

Art Unit: 2146

6/8/08

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146